UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.    | FILING DATE                          | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/523,721         | 02/07/2005                           | Kunihiko Tominaga    | 50049-046           | 1065             |
| 20277<br>MCDERMOTT | 7590 01/10/2008<br>「WILL & EMERY LLP | EXAMINER             |                     |                  |
| 600 13TH STR       | EET, N.W.                            | LEITH, PATRICIA A    |                     |                  |
| WASHINGTO          | N, DC 20005-3096                     |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                    |                                      |                      | 1655                |                  |
|                    |                                      |                      |                     |                  |
|                    |                                      |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                    |                                      |                      | 01/10/2008          | PAPER            |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)       |  |
|-----------------|--------------------|--|
| 10/523,721      | TOMINAGA, KUNIHIKO |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit           |  |
| Patricia Leith  | 1655               |  |

|   | Patricia Leith   | 1655   |   |
|---|--|--|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this commu  | nication appears on the cover sheet with th  | e correspondence add   | ress                                    |
| THE REPLY FILED 20 November 2007 FAILS T  | O PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION  | N FOR ALLOWANCE.   |   |
| <ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but<br/>this application, applicant must timely file of<br/>places the application in condition for allow</li> </ol>  |  | of Appeal. To avoid aba<br>affidavit, or other evider<br>in compliance with 37 C | nce, which<br>FR 41.31; or (3)          |
| <ul> <li>a)</li></ul>   | ing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the ma<br>either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN               | ailing date of the final rejecti   | on.                                     |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.1 have been filed is the date for purposes of determining under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiraset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received be may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See a NOTICE OF APPEAL | the period of extension and the corresponding amount<br>tion date of the shortened statutory period for reply<br>by the Office later than three months after the mailing | unt of the fee. The appropr originally set in the final Offi                     | iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as |
|   | A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e) y must be filed within the time period set forth                             | ), to avoid dismissal of th  |   |
| <ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a   <ul> <li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would red</li> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (s)</li> </ul> </li> </ol>   | quire further consideration and/or search (see   | NOTE below);   |   |
| appeal; and/or  | ut canceling a corresponding number of finally   |  |   |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance w   | ith 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non   | -Compliant Amendment   | (PTOL-324).                             |
| <ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the follow</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s)</li></ol>  |  | ate, timely filed amendme  | ent canceling the                       |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed ame how the new or amended claims would be The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 1-6.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  | rejected is provided below or appended. follows:   | will be entered and an e   | explanation of                          |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE   |  |  |   |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a<br/>because applicant failed to provide a show<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.</li> </ol>   | ring of good and sufficient reasons why the affi   |  |   |
|   | ne date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to<br>ence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under all<br>y it is necessary and was not earlier presented         | ppeal and/or appellant fa  | ils to provide a                        |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  |  |  |   |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been  | considered but does NOT place the application  | on in condition for allowa   | nce because:                            |
| <ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>   | Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).   | aluga  |   |
|   |  | Patricia Leith<br>Primary Examiner<br>Art Unit: 1655                             | 10                                      |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06) Continuation of 3. NOTE: Amendments to claims 1 and 2 would require a new search and consideration on the merits due to the insertion of 'yeasts' into the claims. Further, new claims 7-11 were not previously considered, and it is noted that these new claims appear to be properly restrictable from claims 1-3 (Group I). If these new claims are patentably distinct from claims 1-3, a full explanation of how the claims are patentably distinct will be keenly addressed upon the filing of an RCE if Applicant wishes to extend prosecution of the case.